

## ON THE AUTHORSHIP AND DATE OF PUBLICATION OF THE GENERIC NAME " TYLOS " (CLASS CRUSTACEA, ORDER ISOPODA)

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)501)

The present note is concerned with the question of the date to be assigned to the generic name *Tylos* (Latreille MS.) introduced by Jean-Victor Audouin for a genus of Crustacea (Order Isopoda) in the text prepared by that author for the Crustacea Section of the work by M. J. C. L. de Savigny entitled *Description de l'Egypte*, the plates of which were prepared in the period "1805-1812." This question becomes relevant to the work of the Commission because of the application for the validation of this name submitted by Professor A. Vandel (*Toulouse*) (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 2 : 347 ; *id.*, 1952, *ibid.* 6 : 174-176) in opposition to the proposal previously submitted by Professor Martin L. Aczél (*Tucumán*) (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 2 : 156-157) that the earlier name *Tylos* Meigen, 1800 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera) should be placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*.

2. The authorship of the crustacean name *Tylos* has been attributed by some authors to Audouin and by others to P. A. Latreille ; the date of publication has been treated by some authors as "1825" and by others as "1826." The position as regards these matters is discussed in the following paragraphs.

3. *Authorship of the name "Tylos" as applied to a genus of Crustacea* : As fully explained by Professor Vandel in the second of the two papers referred to above, the duty of preparing the text of the Crustacea Section of Savigny's *Description de l'Egypte* was undertaken by Audouin at the request of the French Government signified in a letter dated "19 mars 1825." In the absence of evidence to the contrary it must therefore certainly be concluded that for the purposes of zoological nomenclature Audouin is the author of all names published for the first time in the foregoing Section of Savigny's work. The only circumstances in which any other author could be accepted as the author of a new name in the Section prepared by Audouin would be if it could be shown that, in the case of some particular name, Audouin had done no more than publish a new name proposed by some other author, that other author's manuscript description for the genus or species concerned being at the same time published by Audouin, that description therefore forming the "indication" required by Article 25 of the *Règles*.

4. Those authors who have treated Latreille and not Audouin as the author of the name *Tylos* have based that view upon the passage in which the name *Tylos* was first introduced, which has been quoted by Professor Vandel in the more recent of the papers referred to above. It is clear from this passage that Audouin recognised that the (at that time unpublished) name *Tylos* had been proposed in manuscript by Latreille, but, in publishing that name, Audouin did not quote from Latreille's manuscripts and the words characterising the genus *Tylos* then published by Audouin were written by that author and not by Latreille. The position is therefore that, as published in the Crustacea Section of Savigny's *Description*, the name *Tylos*, though a manuscript name of Latreille's, was provided with its "indication" by Audouin and not Latreille and must therefore for the purposes of zoological nomenclature be attributed to Audouin and not to Latreille. If it were desired to indicate the full history of this name, the citation "*Tylos* (Latreille MS.) Audouin" could, as Professor Vandel has remarked, be conveniently employed.

5. *Date of publication of the name "Tylos" as applied to a genus of Crustacea* : The Crustacea Section of the text of Savigny's *Description de l'Egypte* is undated and it is necessary therefore to rely upon indirect methods for determining the date to be accepted for names published in it. Those authors who have accepted the date "1825" have relied upon the fact that, as pointed out by Professor Vandel (see paragraph 3 above), the task of preparing this text was committed to Audouin by the Minister of the Interior in a letter dated 19th March, 1825, and they have assumed that between that date and 31st December, 1825, the text was prepared by Audouin and actually published by the authorities. Sherborn (1897, *Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.*, 1897 : 287) examined this question and came to the conclusion that the date "1826" was to be preferred

to the date "1825"; this view was restated by that author in 1931 (*Index Anim.*, Pars secund.: 6700) and had also in the meanwhile been adopted in 1913 by the compiler of the *Catalogue of Books... in the British Museum (Natural History)* (4: 1816). Sherborn's ground for taking this view was based on an examination of all the evidence which he had been able to collect, including (1) a statement by Engelmann (*Bibl. Hist. nat.*: 340) that the Crustacea Section and six other Sections of Part 4 of volume 1 of the *Description* were published in 1826 (2) the letter dated "19 mars 1825" committing the Crustacea Section to Audouin (to which I have referred above) and a paper by Duponchel (1842) where it is stated that it was in 1826 that Audouin was invited to undertake this task (3) a statement by Dr. John Anderson that he had "ascertained that Savigny's sight failed him, and that no manuscripts of any kind were handed over to Audouin, so that Audouin had to begin *de novo*."

6. The evidence discussed above is of interest from a bibliographical point of view but up to 1948 it had no definite bearing on the question of the dates to be assigned to new names in the Crustacea Section of the *Description*, for prior to that year there existed no provisions in the *Règles* for determining the date to be assigned to a zoological name where the date of publication of that name was not known. In 1948 however the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology decided to insert in the *Règles* provisions for regulating this matter (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 223-225). Under that decision a name is to be deemed to have been published on the date specified in the work concerned, as the date of publication (if any such date is so specified) unless and until evidence is forthcoming to show that that date is incorrect and, where no date of publication is given in the work concerned, a name published in that book is to be treated as having been published on a date determined in accordance with a series of rules there laid down, the general effect of which is that such a name is to take priority only as from a date by which evidence may be found that publication had actually taken place.

7. Turning back to the Crustacea Section of Savigny's *Description*, we find that the only date mentioned in it is the date "19 mars 1825," as the date on which the Minister of the Interior asked Audouin to undertake the preparation of the text. So far as the original publication is concerned, the only evidence provided is that at earliest Audouin cannot have begun to write the text until after having received the Minister's invitation of 19th March, 1825. Publication cannot therefore have taken place until such time as, after 19th March, 1825, (1) Audouin wrote the text and (2) that text was printed and published, a twofold process which must have occupied a considerable time and is most unlikely to have been completed in so short a period as nine and a half months (mid-March to end-December), more especially in view of the evidence of Dr. Anderson that Audouin received no manuscripts from Savigny and had therefore to write the entire text himself. In such circumstances publication could hardly have taken place within twelve months at the earliest of the time when Audouin was invited to prepare the text. In other words, the year 1826 must be regarded as the earliest year in which this Section can have been published. There is no direct evidence that this Section was in fact published as early as 1826 and the possibility that publication did not take place until 1827 or even later cannot be excluded. We have however the statement by Englemann that publication took place in 1826 and the similar conclusion reached by Sherborn. On balance, it would seem reasonable to conclude (1) that the name *Tylos* Audouin was published before the end of 1826 but (2) that it is extremely improbable that it was published before the opening of that year. On this basis we should adopt the year "1826" as that in which this name was published. That date, being derived solely from indirect sources, should, when cited, be enclosed within square brackets, as prescribed in such cases by the International Congress of Zoology (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 226, Point (c)).

8. *Conclusions*: The conclusions derived from the foregoing review may be summarised as follows:—

- (1) The name *Tylos*, as a name for a genus of Crustacea, was originally proposed in manuscript by Latreille; it was first published by Audouin; the "indication" by which it was accompanied when it was so published was provided by Audouin and not by means of a quotation from a manuscript of Latreille's. The name *Tylos* is therefore attributable for nomenclatorial purposes to Audouin and not to Latreille, though it would be permissible, if it were so desired, to cite this name as "*Tylos* (Latreille MS.) Audouin."
- (2) The work in which the name *Tylos* Audouin was published is undated, and the date to be attributed to that name can therefore be ascertained only by indirect evidence. On balance it appears that the most probable date for the publication of this name is 1826.
- (3) In the light of (1) and (2) above, this name should be cited as "*Tylos* Audouin, [1826]" or if so preferred, as "*Tylos* (Latreille MS.) Audouin [1826]."